



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,192	11/16/2001	John Saare	SUN-P6492NP US/NC	6370
32615	7590	07/27/2006	EXAMINER	
OSHA LIANG L.L.P./SUN 1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800 HOUSTON, TX 77010			PHILLIPS, HASSAN A	
			ART.UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2151	

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/015,192

Applicant(s)

SAARE ET AL.

Examiner

Hassan Phillips

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 March 2006.  
2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 12-18 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 12-18 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 March 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to communications filed March 29, 2006.

#### ***Drawings***

2. Examiner has received and considered the replacement drawing sheets 1-4, showing Figures 1A-6, filed on March 29, 2006.

#### ***Specification***

3. After consideration of the amendments made to the disclosure to correct minor informalities, examiner has withdrawn the objection to the disclosure. Examiner also acknowledges and thanks applicant for correcting minor typographical errors in the disclosure.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed March 29, 2006, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argued that:
  - a) Murren does not teach or suggest detecting a type of client device submitting a request;
  - b) Murren is completely silent with respect to a hierarchy of Java server page rules and with respect to a version of a Java server page being created by a web page author modifying an existing Java server page;

- c) Romero does not teach or suggest detecting a type of client device submitting a request;
- d) Romero fails to teach or suggest accessing the version of the Java server page and processing the version of the Java server page;
- e) Romero is completely silent with respect to tags;
- f) Romero is completely silent with respect to using tags to access functions contained in an address book server;
- g) AAPA is completely silent with respect to tags;
- h) Murren, Romero, and AAPA, whether considered separately or in combination, clearly fail to teach or suggest including: (i) accessing a plurality of tags contained within a version of a Java server page, where the tags correspond to address book functions of an address book server, or (ii) processing the version of the Java server page using the plurality of tags to access an address book server for providing address book functions.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's assertions.

5. Regarding item a), throughout the disclosure Murren teaches sending replies to a client device **based on the capabilities of the client device** (Murren, paragraphs [0064], [0077], [0145], [0151], [0153], etc.). Examiner submits these teachings of Murren at the least suggest detection of the type of client. Nevertheless, as indicated in previous actions, even if Murren fails to expressly disclose detecting the type of client,

Art Unit: 2151

Romero would make up for such deficiencies where Romero discloses detecting the type of client, (Romero, paragraphs [0038], [0040]). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Romero with Murren for reasons indicated in previous office actions.

6. Regarding item b), as mentioned in previous actions, and as previously indicated, Murren discloses accessing a Java server page corresponding to a request, [Murren, paragraph [0148]]; and teaches sending replies to a client device **based on the capabilities of the client device** (Murren, paragraphs [0064], [0077], [0145], [0151], [0153], etc.). Examiner submits these teachings of Murren at the least suggest a hierarchy of Java server page rules and a version of a Java server page being created by a web page author modifying an existing Java server page. Nevertheless, as indicated in previous actions, even if Murren fails to expressly disclose detecting the type of client, Romero would make up for such deficiencies where Romero discloses accessing a version of a server page corresponding to a request, wherein the version of the server page is accessed using a hierarchy of server page rules and is created by a web page author (14) modifying an existing server page, and wherein the hierarchy of server page rule specifies the version of the server page to transmit to the client based on a device type associated with the client, (Romero, paragraphs [0006]-[0008], [0038], [0040]). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Romero with Murren for reasons indicated in previous office actions.

7. Regarding item c), as acknowledged by the applicant, Romero discloses gathering a maximum document size for a device based on information sent in a request, (Romero, paragraph [0040]). Examiner submits that the information sent in the request is information used to detect the type of client. Examiner further submits that such an interpretation of applicant's claim language is appropriate since there is no indication in applicant's claim language that a client device is detected otherwise.

8. Regarding item d), based on the above, it would be clear that the combined teachings of Murren and Romero provide a means for accessing the version of the Java server page and processing the version of the Java server page. Clearly, in previous actions, accessing the version of the Java server page was interpreted by the examiner to be accessing the original page requested by a user in the teachings of Romero (paragraph [0038]). Also, processing the version of the Java server page was interpreted by the examiner to be segmenting the original page requested by the user, (Romero paragraph [0038]).

9. Regarding items e), f), g), and h), as indicated by the applicant in the remarks, Romero clearly discloses the use of tags, (Romero paragraph [0042]). Examiner maintains the combined teachings of Murren, Romero, and AAPA provide a means for (i) accessing a plurality of tags contained within a version of a Java server page, where the tags correspond to address book functions of an address book server, and (ii) processing the version of the Java server page using the plurality of tags to

access an address book server for providing address book functions. One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Romero with Murren and AAPA, for reasons indicated in previous office actions.

10. Furthermore, the examiner has interpreted the claim language as broadly as possible. It is also the examiner's position that applicant has not yet submitted claims drawn to limitations which define the operation and apparatus of applicant's disclosed invention in a manner that distinguishes over the prior art. Failure for applicant to significantly narrow definition/scope of the claims implies the applicant intends broad interpretation be given to the claims. The examiner has interpreted the claims with scope parallel to the applicant in the response and reiterated the need for applicant to define the claimed invention more clearly and distinctly. Accordingly the references supplied by the examiner in the previous office action covers the claimed limitations. The rejections are thus sustained. Applicant is requested to review the prior art of record for further consideration.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 1-6, 12-18, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murren et al. (hereinafter Murren), U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0078960, in view of Romero et al. (hereinafter Romero), U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0059367, and further in view of the Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

13. In considering claims 1 and 12, Murren teaches a method and system for providing extensible client functions using a distributed computer network comprising: receiving a request for functions from a client device, (page 1, paragraphs 7-8); accessing a Java server page corresponding to the request, (page 16, paragraph 148); accessing a plurality of tags contained within the Java server page, (page 16, paragraph 149); processing the Java server page using the tags to access a server for providing the functions, (page 16, paragraph 149, Fig. 2, and Fig. 10); and transmitting the processed Java server page, including information responsive to the request, to the client device, (page 16, paragraph 149, Fig. 2, and Fig. 10).

Although the disclosed method and system taught by Murren shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly disclose: detecting a type of the client device submitting the request, and accessing a hierarchy of Java server page rules that specify a version of a Java server page to transmit to the client device based on the type of client device detected, wherein the version of the Java server page is created by a web page author modifying an existing Java server page.

Nevertheless, the teachings of Murren suggest detection of the type of client, (paragraphs [0064], [0077], [0145], [0151], [0153]). The teachings of Murren also



suggest a hierarchy of Java server page rules and a version of a Java server page being created by a web page author modifying an existing Java server page (paragraphs [0064], [0077], [0145], [0151], [0153]). In a similar field of endeavor, Romero expressly teaches a method comprising: accessing a version of a server page corresponding to a request, wherein the version of the server page is accessed using a hierarchy of server page rules and is created by a web page author (14) modifying an existing server page, and wherein the hierarchy of server page rules specifies the version of the server page to transmit to the client based on a device type associated with the client, (paragraphs [0006-0008], paragraph [0038], [0040]).

Thus, if not implicit in the teachings of Murren, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Murren with Romero to expressly disclose detecting a type of the client device submitting the request, and accessing a hierarchy of Java server page rules that specify a version of a Java server page to transmit to the client device based on the type of client device detected, wherein the version of the Java server page is created by a web page author modifying an existing Java server page. This would have further provided an efficient means for providing extensible client functions to low bandwidth, small display, and small memory devices, (Romero, paragraph [0037]).

Although the modified method and system taught by Murren shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to further expressly disclose: the functions being address book functions.

Nevertheless, on page 3, lines 9-15, of the Applicants disclosure, the Applicant admits that Web portals providing e-address books, have become increasingly popular.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Murren with the AAPA to show the functions being address book functions. This would have provided an efficient means for users of different domains and different types of client devices to access extensible client address book functions using a distributed computer network, (Murren, paragraphs [0006-0009]).

14. In considering claims 2 and 13, Murren further teaches accessing the version of the Java server page corresponding to the request comprises retrieving the Java server page from a set of compiled Java server page classes. See page 22, paragraph 204.

15. In considering claims 3 and 14, the combined teachings of Murren and the AAPA provide a means for the tags contained within the Java server page to be configured to provide access to address book functions provided by an address book server. See Murren pages 8-10, paragraphs 100-109.

16. In considering claims 4 and 15, the combined teachings of Murren and the AAPA provide a means for providing extended address book functions by accessing a plurality of extended tags contained within the Java server page, wherein address book functions are extended by adding the extended tags corresponding to new address

book functionality of an address book server. See Murren pages 19-21, paragraphs 183-202.

17. In considering claims 5 and 16, Murren teaches transmitting the processed Java server page to the client device in accordance with WAP (wireless application protocol) communication standards. See page 2, paragraph 39.

18. In considering claims 6 and 17, Murren teaches transmitting the processed Java server page to the client device in accordance with WML (wireless markup language) communication standards. See page 4, paragraph 62.

19. In considering claim 18, the combined teachings of Murren and Romero provide a means for specifying a command tag of the plurality of tags to build a collection of objects, (Murren, paragraphs [0094-0101], paragraph [0149], Romero, paragraphs [0006-0008], paragraph [0038], [0040]); specifying a collection tag of the plurality of tags to access the collection of objects, (Murren, paragraphs [0094-0101], paragraph [0149], Romero, paragraphs [0006-0008], paragraph [0038], [0040]); and specifying a bean tag of the plurality of tags to access an individual object within the collection of objects, (Murren, paragraphs [0094-0101], paragraph [0149], Romero, paragraphs [0006-0008], paragraph [0038], [0040]). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Murren with Romero for reasons previously indicated in considering claim 1.

***Conclusion***

20. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hassan Phillips whose telephone number is (571) 272-3940. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2151

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HP/  
7/21/06

Khanh Dinh  
Primary Examiner